Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

December 2017

Young People & Gambling 2017

A research study among 11-16 year olds on behalf of the Gambling Commission

Young People Omnibus 2017, Technical Note

GAMBLING COMMISSION

Contents

Technical Details

1 Technical Details

Ipsos MORI, on behalf of the Gambling Commission, conducted research among 11-16 year olds to identify the prevalence of gambling, and to explore gambling behaviour and attitudes among young people.

The study included research into gambling behaviours, such as where young people gamble and with whom, perceptions of gambling and awareness of gambling advertising. The survey also asked a series of questions relating to potential issues associated with gambling and utilised the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screener to define typologies of gamblers[1].

The findings are based on data from a representative sample of 2,881 11-16 year olds in Great Britain, comprising 2,612 11-16 year olds attending academies[2] and maintained[3] schools in England and Wales and 269 young people attending maintained schools in Scotland. The research was conducted in schools, with pupils filling out paper self-completion questionnaires under supervision by Ipsos MORI's interviewers.

1.1 Objectives

The overall aim of this research study was to explore gambling behaviours and attitudes. The survey covered the following key issues:

- Rates of gambling on different types of games (including the National Lottery)
- Experiences of online gambling and 'gambling-style games'
- Perceptions of gambling and reasons for gambling for the first time
- The role of gambling advertising and social media
- The incidence of 'problem' and 'at risk' gamblers
- Further insights on participation in National Lottery games

1.2 Research design

1.2.1 Sampling

The Young People's Omnibus aims to represent pupils aged 11-16 years attending academies and maintained secondary and middle schools in England and Wales, with the additional booster in Scotland.

A three-stage sampling method was used:

[1] A revised version of the adult DSM-IV screening instrument as developed by Dr S. Fisher, 2000.

[2] Academies (including free schools) are public funded, independent schools, held accountable through a legally binding 'funding agreement'.

[3] Maintained schools are overseen, or 'maintained' by the Local Authority.

i. In England and Wales, a sample of schools was selected from Edubase (a comprehensive listing of secondary schools in England and Wales). Special schools and sixth form colleges were excluded from the sampling frame. The frame was stratified by Government Office Region (GOR) and, within each stratum, schools were selected proportional to the number of pupils attending the school. In total 446 schools were selected to participate in the survey. In Scotland, a sample of 34 schools was selected from the Scottish Government's school contacts database. The sample was stratified by LA, deprivation and school size;

ii. one curriculum year group (Year 7-Year 11[4]) selected at random for each school. Interviewers were instructed to select only mixed ability class groups for interview;

iii. all members of a randomly-selected class group within the nominated curriculum year selected to fill out the self-completion survey.

1.2.2 Response rate

Introductory letters were sent to all selected schools, providing them with information regarding the survey background and methodology. In Scotland, in advance of contacting schools, letters were sent to Directors of Education in each local authority requesting permission to approach establishments in their area.

Of the 446 schools approached in England and Wales, 103 schools participated, giving an unadjusted school response rate of 23%. Overall, fully completed questionnaires were obtained from 2,612 pupils aged 11-16 years; an average of 25 pupils per class.

In Scotland, from a sample of 34 schools, 12 agreed to participate, giving an unadjusted response rate of 36%. In total, 269 pupils participated in Scotland; an average of 22 pupils per class.

This year, the Gambling Commission's analysis generally focuses on 11-16 year olds. As it is legal to play the National Lottery from the age of 16, reporting on the National Lottery is based on 11-15 year olds, as in previous years.

1.2.3 Fieldwork

Interviewing was carried out through self-completion questionnaires with the whole class in one classroom period.

Interviewers attempted to secure interviews from all pupils in selected classes. If more than four pupils were absent on the day of interview, interviewers returned to the class to conduct 'mop up' sessions at a later date.

Interviewing was carried out through self-completion questionnaires with the whole class in one classroom period. An Ipsos MORI interviewer was present to explain the survey to pupils, to reassure them about the confidentiality of the survey, to assist them in completing the questionnaire, and to collect completed questionnaires.

Fieldwork for the study was conducted from 6th February to 17th May 2017.

[4] Years S1 to S5 in Scotland.

1.2.4 Weighting

Data are weighted by gender, age and region. The weights were derived from data supplied by the Department for Education, StatsWales and Scottish Government's school contacts database. The effect of weighting is shown in the sample profile.

1.3 Presentation and interpretation of data

When interpreting the findings, it is important to remember that results are based on a sample of the maintained school population, and not the entire population. Consequently, results are subject to sampling tolerances, and not all differences between sub-groups are statistically significant. A guide to statistical significance is included in section 1.5 of this technical report.

In tables and charts, where percentages do not add up to 100%, this is due to multiple answers, to computer rounding, or to the exclusion of 'Don't know' or 'No response' categories. Throughout the tables an asterisk (*) denotes a value greater than zero, but less than 0.5%.

1.4 Sample profile

The following table outlines the details of the sample profile for the 2017 study; covering all 11-16 year olds who participated in the Young People Omnibus. This is the first year in which Ipsos MORI approached schools in Scotland as part of the study. The subsequent table compares the sample profile for the current project with the previous four studies (2013-2016).

Sample profile - 2017	Sample size (unweighted)	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Total[5]	2,881	100	100
Gender of Pupils			
Male	1,380	48	50
Female	1,464	51	49
Age of Pupils			
11	246	9	7
12	663	23	21
13	583	20	20
14	647	22	21
15	477	17	18
16	265	9	13
Year of Pupils[6]			
7	693	24	21
8	592	21	21
9	641	22	20
10	572	20	20
11	383	13	19
Ethnic Origin			
White	2230	77	77
BME	615	21	21
Region			
London	330	12	14
South East	378	13	14
South West	276	10	9
North East	51	2	4
North West	393	14	12
East of England	333	12	10
East Midlands	255	9	8
West Midlands	404	14	10
Yorkshire & Humberside	164	6	9
Scotland	269	9	7
Wales	28	1	4

[5] Where responses do not sum to 100% this is due to 'not stated' responses

[6] For Scotland year groups S1 = year 7, S2 = year 8, S3 = year 9, S4 = year 10 and S5 = year 11

Sample profile – 2013-2017	2013 Weighted %	2014 Weighted %	2015 Weighted %	2016 Weighted %	2017 Weighted %
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Gender of Pupils					
Male	50	50	50	51	50
Female	49	49	49	49	49
Age of Pupils[7]					
11	9	8	9	10	7
12	20	19	19	20	21
13	20	20	19	20	20
14	20	21	21	19	21
15	19	20	21	21	18
16	12	11	11	10	13
Year of Pupils					
7	19	19	19	20	21
8	20	20	20	20	21
9	20	20	20	20	20
10	21	20	20	20	20
11	20	21	21	20	19
Region					
London	13	14	14	14	14
South East	15	15	15	15	14
South West	9	9	9	9	9
North East	5	5	5	5	4
North West	13	12	12	12	12
East of England	11	11	11	11	10
East Midlands	8	9	9	8	8
West Midlands	10	11	11	11	10
Yorkshire & Humberside	10	10	10	10	9
Wales	7	6	6	5	4
Scotland	-	-	-	-	7

1.5 Statistical reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total population, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been interviewed (the true values). We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the true values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the true value will fall within a specified

[7] For Scotland year groups S1 = year 7, S2 = year 8, S3 = year 9, S4 = year 10 and S5 = year 11

range. The table below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence interval.

Size of sample on which survey results is based	Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	±	±	±
100 interviews	6	9	10
500 interviews	3	4	4
1,000 interviews	2	3	3
2,881 interviews (Young People Omnibus children aged 11-16)	1	2	2

Source: Ipsos MORI

For example, with a sample of 2,881 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the "true" value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 2 percentage points from the sample result.

Strictly speaking, the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples, although they offer an approximation for the complex design used by the current study.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be "real", or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is "statistically significant", we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume "95% confidence interval", the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below:

Size of sample compared	Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	±	±	±
100 and 100	8	13	14
250 and 100	7	11	12
500 and 250	5	7	8
500 and 500	4	6	6
1,000 and 500	3	5	5
1,000 and 1,000	3	4	4
1,500 and 1,000	2	4	4

Source: Ipsos MORI

1.6 Acknowledgements

It is clear that schools are increasingly working under great pressure from a number of different sources and that they receive numerous requests to participate in surveys such as this. We would like to thank the many schools that took part and we are indebted to all pupils and staff who made this survey possible.

1.7 Publication of data

As with all our studies, these results are subject to our Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any publication of results requires the prior approval of Ipsos MORI. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy and misrepresentation.

2 Problem Gambling Overview

2.1 Problem gambling screen method

The study asks a series of questions relating to potential issues associated with gambling and uses the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screener to define typologies of gamblers[8]. The DSM-IV-MR-J screen was applied in three key steps:

1) Respondents included in the screen were 11-16 year olds in England, Scotland and Wales.
2) If respondents stated they had not gambled in the past 12 months at any one of the DSM-IV questions where this is an answer option but have spent their own money on any gambling activity in the past 7 days and have a DSM-IV score of 0 or more, we have retained their data.[9]
3) If respondents had not answered any of the DSM-IV questions, we coded these as missing and excluded these from the analysis.
4) Points were awarded to each respondent based on the answers they gave to the screening questions. The table below indicates how the questions asked in 2017 mapped onto the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screen components.

Problem gambler criteria from the DSM-IV-MR-J screen			
2017 Question No.	**DSM-IV criteria**	**Question wording: *During the past 12 months . . . .***	**If any of the following answer criteria are ticked, that qualifies as 1 point**
QG11	Preoccupation	Have you found yourself thinking about gambling or planning to gamble	'Often'
QG14	Tolerance	Have you needed to gamble with more and more money to get the amount of excitement you want	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QG13	Withdrawal	Have you felt bad or fed up when trying to cut down on gambling	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QG15	Loss of control	Have you ever spent much more than you planned to on gambling	'Often'[10]
QG12	Escape	Have you gambled to escape from problems or when you were feeling bad	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QG18	Chasing	After losing money on gambling have you returned another day, try to win back the money you lost	'More than half the time' or 'every time'
QG17	Lying	Has you gambling ever led to the following: telling lies to family/friends or others	'Once or twice', 'sometimes' or 'often'
QG16	Illegal acts	Have you ever taken money from any of the following without permission to spend on gambling: Dinner money or fare money Money from family Money from things you've sold Money from outside the family Somewhere else	If any one or more of these options are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total
QG17	Risked relationships	Has your gambling ever led to the following: a) Arguments with family/friends or others d) Missing school	If any of the following are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total: 'once or twice', 'sometimes' or 'often'
			Source: Ipsos MORI

[8] A revised version of the adult DSM-IV screening instrument as developed by Dr S. Fisher, 2000.
[9] This differs from previous years where respondents who stated they did not gamble at any of the DSM-IV questions were excluded from the analysis.
[10] The 2017 study returns to Fisher's original recommendation that a score of 1 is given to those who say they spent more money than planned 'often', whereas the preceding studies had applied a score of 1 to those who said they had spent more money than planned 'sometimes' or 'often'.

5) Using the DSM-IV-MR-J screen, a respondent who confirms that they have undertaken four or more of the behaviours / actions (from the overall screen of nine components outlined above) is considered a problem gambler, a score of two or three is used to identify an at-risk gambler and a score of zero or one indicates a non-problem gambler .

2.2 Problem gambling screen analysis

The following table presents results for 11-16 year olds, based on screening from the full dataset for 2017.

Prevalence of at risk or problem gambling (11-16 year olds) amongst key sub-groups

	2017	*Type of gambler*		
		Non-problem	***At risk***	***Problem***
Total	*2,803*	15.5% (n=428)	1.3% (n=34)	0.9% (n=25)
Gender				
Boys	*1,339*	19.3%	1.7% (n=21)	1.6% (n=22)
Girls	*1,427*	11.1%	0.7% (n=9)	0.2% (n=3)
Age				
11	*239*	12.4%	1.5% (n=4)	0.0% (n=0)
12	*640*	15.8%	0.7% (n=4)	0.2% (n=1)
13	*557*	16.9%	1.8% (n=9)	0.9% (n=6)
14	*639*	18.0%	1.0% (n=7)	1.9% (n=12)
15	*469*	12.5%	1.5% (n=6)	1.1% (n=5)
16	*259*	15.3%	1.9% (n=4)	0.5% (n=1)

Base: All aged 11-16 – excluding 'missing' values (2,803)

Jane Stevens
Research Director
Jane.Stevens@ipsos.com

Will Dawes
Research Manager
Will.Dawes@ipsos.com

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos-mori.com
http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI

About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute

The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methods and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.